arXiv:1406.0712v3 [cond-mat.supr-con] 26 Feb 2015

Current, conduction, and localization in quantum many-body systems

Balázs Hetényi
Department of Physics, Bilkent University 06800, Ankara, Turkey

A representation of current is presented which can account for ideal conduction and distinguish superconductors, superfluids, ideal, and non-ideal conductors. The idea of the scheme is that different current operators and transport weights can be constructed based on the number of charge carriers in basic units of conduction. Ideal conductors with basic units of p charge carriers exhibit a flux quantization rule of $\Phi_B = nhc/(pe)$ (for example $p = 2$ for BCS). Extension of the current operators to lattice systems is also presented. A full diagonalization calculation for an interacting model of spinless fermions of all the transport coefficients is carried out. It is shown that in a number of strongly correlated models ideal conduction involving the simultaneous motion of all charge carriers is possible.

Introduction.- Current is one of the fundamental quantities of condensed matter physics. Magnetism [1], conduction [2], superconductivity [3], superfluidity [4], involve different manifestations of current. One of the main properties of insulators, polarization, is obtained by calculating or measuring the integrated current between adiabatically connected states [5]. A desirable property of the description [6] of current is that these phenomena are included as well as distinguished [7].

A question of interest within condensed matter physics is metal-insulator transitions [8] (MIT). An enduring paradigm for the Mott MIT is that an insulating state due to correlations arises at certain (usually half) fillings. This conclusion is apparently supported by studies of the Hubbard and related models. The Hubbard model is also the starting point for studies on high-T_c superconductivity [9]. Insulation is believed to arise, inspite of the fact that the Hamiltonian of these models *commute* with the total momentum operator [10, 11]. It is usually argued that this is not relevant at half filling [10, 12–14]; the opening of a gap [12], investigations of one-body current and the associated transport coefficient [13], or the presence of umklapp processes [14] give rise to insulating state.

A contradiction seems to arise when the Hubbard model is considered from the point of view of localization. Kohn [2] has set forth the hypothesis that insulation is a result of many-body localization. In insulating materials the total position of large (macroscopic) clusters of charge carriers are localized. Localization in crystalline systems can be studied via the Berry phase theory of polarization [5, 15, 16]. The quantities introduced in this theory make the consistent calculation of many-body localization [15, 16] in crystalline systems possible. It can be shown easily that when the localization criterion of this theory is applied to the Hubbard model, the result is that the Hubbard eigenstates are always delocalized, and in view of Kohn's hypothesis they are conductors rather than insulators. One aim of this paper is to resolve this contradiction.

Statement of results.- In this letter a representation of the current is presented. The representation has already been applied to resolve the differences between transport coefficients [7]. Current in a quantum many-body system can be written [7, 17] in terms of distinct expectation values J_p based on the p-body momentum. To each J_p corresponds a weight D_p, sensitive to ideal conduction in which the charge carriers are p-particle clusters, similar to the concept of "basic groups" introduced by Yang [18]. D_p can be written as an expectation value over the reduced density matrix of order p (p-RDM). It is shown that the states which contribute to D_p are simultaneous eigenstates of the p-RDM and the p-body momentum. If, for a particular system, the minimum p for which D_p is finite is p_m, then all D_p with $p \geq p_m$ are also finite. In this sense the transport quantities D_p behave in a similar way to off-diagonal long-range order (ODLRO) as shown by Yang [18]. It is also shown that the flux quantization rule associated with a system with p_m is $\Phi_B = nh/(p_m ce)$ with n integer. For a BCS type superconductor $p_m = 2$, but for an ideal conductor $p_m \approx N$, the number of particles, hence the flux is continuous.

The lattice analog of the formalism is developed and applied to well-known strongly correlated models. First, the operators for different currents J_p are given along with their associated transport coefficients D_p. We stress that previous calculations [1, 8, 12–14] used the one-body current and transport coefficient J_1 and D_1. A more complete picture of conduction emerges if all of the above quantities are calculated. For the Hubbard model or the model of interacting spinless fermions D_N is always finite. A finite D_N corresponds to simultaneous motion of all charge carriers, similar to Fröhlich superconductivity [19].

A mathematical subtlety.- The textbook expression for the current is a sum over single particle momentum operators averaged over some wavefunction. This definition hides a mathematical subtlety. For N identical particles, the two expressions

$$J = \frac{N}{m}\Phi + \lim_{\Delta X \to 0} \frac{1}{m\Delta X} \mathrm{Im}\langle\Psi| \exp\left(i\Delta X \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{p}_i \right] \right) |\Psi\rangle, \tag{1}$$

and

$$J = \frac{N}{m}\Phi + \lim_{\Delta X \to 0} \frac{N}{m\Delta X} \mathrm{Im}\langle\Psi| \exp\left(i\Delta X \hat{p}_1 \right) |\Psi\rangle, \tag{2}$$

tend to the same limit, but they are not equivalent. The former can be written in terms of the full density matrix, N-RDM, the latter in terms of 1-RDM. Even when the limit is taken

$$J(\Phi) = \frac{N}{m}\Phi + \frac{1}{m}\langle\Psi|\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{p}_i\right]|\Psi\rangle, \tag{3}$$

the issue remains: if a many-body wavefunction of identical particles is an eigenstate of $\hat{p}_i$ it is also an eigenstate of $[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{p}_i]$, but the converse of this statement is not necessarily true. In fact the eigenstates are even qualitatively different: the former is a product of plane-waves, the latter is of the form

$$\exp\left(iK\sum_{i=1}^{N}x_i\right)\gamma(x_1,...,x_N), \tag{4}$$

where $\gamma(x_1,...,x_N)$ depends only on the differences between coordinates.

We also remark that the current defined in Eq. (1) can not be derived from the continuity equation the usual way. However, Resta [15] has shown that the time dependence of the total position operator corresponds to the current in Eq. (1).

Current operators and transport coefficients.- We consider a system of N identical particles with Hamiltonian,

$$H(\Phi) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{(\hat{p}_i+\Phi)^2}{2m} + \hat{V}. \tag{5}$$

For simplicity a one-dimensional system is considered, generalization to larger dimensions is trivial. The quantity Φ represents a momentum shift. In practice it can correspond to the vector potential in charged systems, or the angular velocity in the rotating bucket experiment for superfluid helium. We assume periodic boundary conditions.

The current is defined as the derivative of the ground state energy ($E(\Phi) = \langle\Psi(\Phi)|H(\Phi)|\Psi(\Phi)\rangle$) which would result in Eq. (3), however, minding the issue raised in Eqs. (1-3) we define a general current specific to a group with p particles as

$$J_p(\Phi) = \frac{N}{m}\Phi + \frac{(N/p)}{m}\langle\Psi(\Phi)|\hat{P}_p|\Psi(\Phi)\rangle. \tag{6}$$

with $\hat{P}_p = [\sum_{i=1}^{p}\hat{p}_i]$, and the associated transport coefficient as

$$D_p = \left[\frac{\partial J_p(\Phi)}{\partial\Phi}\right]_{\Phi=0} \tag{7}$$

If the wavefunction $|\Psi(\Phi)\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $\hat{P}_p$ then $D_p = N/m$ (proving this is similar to the standard proof of the Hellman-Feynman theorem). When this is not the case, then it can be shown that

$$D_p = \left[\frac{\partial J_p(\Phi)}{\partial\Phi}\right]_{\Phi=0} = \frac{N}{m} + \frac{i(N/p)}{m}\langle\Psi|[\hat{X}_p,\hat{P}_p]|\Psi\rangle. \tag{8}$$

The steps for showing this are based on writing the derivative in Φ in terms of momentum shift operators, for more details see Refs. [7, 17]. The second term reduces to ordinary one-body position-momentum commutators cancelling the first term, hence $D_p = 0$. Note that if $\hat{P}_p$ commutes with $\hat{\rho}_p$ not only will $D_p = N/m$, but all the higher order D_ps will give the same value. It is in this sense that these results can be viewed as a generalization of Yang's results [18] which established a hierarchy in RDMs which exhibit ODLRO [22] (or condensation). ODLRO corresponds to macroscopic occupation of the eigenstate of the RDM with *zero momentum.* The quantities D_p are sensitive to eigenstates of the p-momentum with *any momentum eigenvalue.*

Flux quantization.- A well known property of superconductors is flux quantization in a cavity [20, 23] according to the rule $\Phi_B = nhc/(2e)$, with n integer. The analog of flux quantization in supefluid helium is vortex quantization [24]. As shown by Byers and Yang [23] a quantized flux in a superconducting system can be derived by applying a gauge transformation to the wavefunction which eliminates the momentum shift (Φ in Eq. (5)), and then requiring that the wavefunction remain single valued. The flux quantization rule found by Byers and Yang is $\Phi_B = nhc/e$, therefore not entirely in agreement with the experimental result.

Considering a conducting system with a cavity let us write the Hamiltonian of the system as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{1}{2m}\left[\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_j)\right]^2\Psi + \hat{V}\Psi = E\Psi. \tag{9}$$

The curl of the vector potential corresponds to the magnetic field which is zero inside the conductor. The vector potential can therefore be written as the gradient of a scalar function $\mathbf{A} = \nabla\chi$. The gauge transformation is of the form

$$\Psi' = \exp\left(i\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{e}{c\hbar}\chi(\mathbf{r}_j)\right)\Psi, \tag{10}$$

but, in contrast to Byers and Yang [23] we require that the wavefunction is single valued when a *basic group of charge carriers* is carried around the cavity, leading to the modified flux quantization rule

$$\Phi_B = \frac{ch}{pe}. \tag{11}$$

For a paired system $p = 2$ as expected [20, 23]. As $p \to \infty$ the flux is no longer quantized.

Second quantization, lattice models.- Lattice models, such as the Hubbard model, or the spinless fermion model ($t-V$) are usually described in second quantization. In the absence of disorder these models typically consist of a tight-binding term and a short-range potential. The

effect of the external field appears in the hopping parameter giving rise to a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\hat{H}(\Phi) = -t\sum_{i=1}^{N}\{e^{i\Phi}c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + \text{H. c.}\} + \hat{V}_{int}. \quad (12)$$

The current operators for continuous systems (Eq. (6)) are defined by the generators of translations. On a lattice the generators of translations are the position shift operators. In general, one can define a p-particle shift operator as

$$\hat{U}_p = \sum_{i_1}...\sum_{i_p}\hat{c}_{i_1}^\dagger...\hat{c}_{i_p}^\dagger\hat{c}_{i_1+1}...\hat{c}_{i_p+1}. \quad (13)$$

In reciprocal space this operator becomes

$$\hat{U}_p = \sum_{k_1}...\sum_{k_p}\exp(iK_p)\hat{n}_{k_1}...\hat{n}_{k_p}, \quad (14)$$

where $K_p = \sum_{j=1}^{p} k_i$, and the summation is over distinct values of k_i. Note the similarity between the lattice shift operator and the generator of position shifts. The Hubbard Hamiltonian manifestly commutes with the total position shift $\hat{U}_N$, thus we can label its eigenstates with K the total momentum. The spread in total position [15, 16] can be written

$$\sigma_N^2 = -\lim_{L\to\infty}\frac{L^2}{2\pi^2}\text{Re}\ln\langle\Psi|\exp\left(i\frac{2\pi}{L}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{x}_i\right)|\Psi\rangle. \quad (15)$$

which, since the operator $\exp\left(i\frac{2\pi}{L}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{x}_i\right)$ is the total momentum shift, is infinite for the Hubbard model. This proves that the ground state of the Hubbard model is delocalized, and is, according to the criterion of Kohn, a metal, never an insulator, apart from trivial cases (filling of one or zero).

Current, transport coefficients.- Using the position shift operators the current operators can be constructed explicitly. We define

$$\hat{J}_p = i(\hat{U}_p - \hat{U}_p^\dagger) = 2\sum_{k_1}...\sum_{k_p}\sin(K_p)n_{k_1}...n_{k_p}. \quad (16)$$

For $\hat{J}_1$ we obtain the usual one-body current operator

$$\hat{J}_1 = i\sum_j(\hat{c}_j^\dagger\hat{c}_{j+1} - \hat{c}_{j+1}^\dagger\hat{c}_j). \quad (17)$$

Using the current we can define the weights as

$$D_p = \left[\frac{\partial J_p(\Phi)}{\partial\Phi}\right]_{\Phi=0}, \quad (18)$$

where the perturbed current will have the form

$$J_p(\Phi) = \langle\Psi(\Phi)|\hat{J}_p(\Phi)|\Psi(\Phi)\rangle, \quad (19)$$

with $\hat{J}_p(\Phi) = 2\sum_{k_1}...\sum_{k_p}\sin(K_p + p\Phi)n_{k_1}...n_{k_p}$. For the case $p = N$ if the wavefunction Ψ is an eigenstate of the N-body current operator, then $D_N = N$ (which holds for the Hubbard model). In this case ideal conduction can arise from the simultaneous motion of all charge carriers, maintaining their relative positions compared to the center of mass of the total charge distribution.

Model calculation.- To understand the significance of the different current expressions and their derivatives we investigate their behavior in a lattice model of spinless fermions, whose Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = -t\sum_i(c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + c_{i+1}^\dagger c_i) + V\sum_i\hat{n}_i\hat{n}_{i+1}. \quad (20)$$

The calculation is based on a full diagonalization of this Hamiltonian in reciprocal space. The calculation was done in reciprocal space since in this case the currents and associated weights are directly accessible. However, due to the fact that the Hamiltonian matrix is not sparse in this basis, the diagonalization is more difficult than in real space. The calculations are based on calculating the ground state energy and wavefunction in the absence and presence of a phase. Using the ground state wavefunction we then calculate the different currents (J_p) and we obtain the weights (D_p) from a finite difference estimate of the derivative. The results are shown in Fig. 1 for a system of 12 lattice sites and 6 particles. For large system sizes this model is thought to exhibit a MIT at $V = t$.

The quantities D_p show different behavior as V increases. The quantity normally associated with the Drude weight (D_1) decreases quicker than the others. The value of D_p for a given value of V increases monotonically with p. As expected D_6 does not decrease at all, due to the fact that the total current commutes with the Hamiltonian. These results indicate that D_1 going to zero does not necessarily result in insulation, since larger transport coefficients can still remain finite.



FIG. 1. D_i quantities calculate for a model of spinless interacting fermions. The lattice size is 12, the particle number is 6.

Analysis.- According to the above reasoning the Hubbard model and the spinless fermion model with nearest neighbor interaction are both ideal conductors, exhibiting conduction similar to Fröhlich superconductivity [19],

although, unlike in Ref. [19] here this behavior is not a result of incommensurate filling. This conclusion appears to contradict what is thought about these models, hence elaboration is necessary. Let us remark that the line of argument presented above is not new (Eq. (3) in Ref. [10, 11]), the central issue is the mathematical subtlety pointed out in Eqs. (1-3).

The above analysis defines a set of transport coefficients D_p. To understand the nature of conduction in a given model, one must, at least in principle, calculate all of them. If all are zero, then ideal conduction can be ruled out. In the case of the Hubbard model, the conclusion that it is insulating was very often based on the calculation of one-body quantities (excitation gap [1, 8], chemical potential [12], one-body current-current correlation functions [8]). These calculations are equivalent to calculating D_1. For the Hubbard model in one-dimension it is easy to see that D_1 is finite for $U = 0$, but becomes zero immediately for finite U, since the wavefunctions are even qualitatively different for the two cases. On the other hand, D_N will always remain finite for any Hamiltonian which only has an interaction potential. Solving the Hubbard model in one dimension, Lieb and Wu [12] base the conclusion regarding insulation on calculating the chemical potential μ (indicative of a gap in single-particle excitations for finite U). The gap only gives information about D_1. In fact the wavefunction of the form in Eq. (**??**) is easily seen to be gapless; the parameter K can be varied continuously and the function will still be an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. As K is varied the energy will also vary continuously and there will be no gap in the N-particle excitations, even if there is a gap in the single-particle ones. Bosonization calculations [14] are also limited in that the only information obtained is about single-particle properties, since there too the Hamiltonian is written in terms of single particle momentum densities.

For the spinless $t-V$ model transport coefficients were calculated by Shastry and Sutherland [13], finding that for large values of the coupling the system is insulating. The paper states explicitly, however, that the current operator they use commutes only with the hopping part of the Hamiltonian, and not the interaction [13]. This suggests that the current they considered was J_1, and therefore, the possibility that the other D_p are finite is left open. There is also a difficulty with associating the ground state energy of the Bethe ansatz solution with the Drude weight. The ground state energy in integrable models is typically of the form $E = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(k_i)$, a sum over one-body contributions. In this definition a reduction to the one-body RDM is implicit. Taking the derivative with respect to a momentum shift will give J_1 and D_1.

Conclusion.- In this paper, by extending the definition of current, it was shown that a number of well-known strongly correlated models, such as the Hubbard model exhibit ideal conduction (similar to Fröhlich superconductivity [19]). Given that the Hubbard model is the usual starting point in high-T_c superconductivity [9] studies, these results call for a reinterpretation how these models are applied to real materials.

The author acknowledges financial support from the Turkish agency for basic research (TÜBITAK, grants no. 112T176 and 113F334). The author would like to thank Natan Andrei and for very helpful discussions. The author also thanks Balázs Dóra for reading the manuscript, making helpful comments, and insightful discussions.

[1] P. Fazekas, *Lecture Notes on Electron Correlation and Magnetism*, World Scientific (1999).
[2] W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **133** (1964) A171.
[3] P. G. DeGennes, *Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys*, Westview, (1999); J. R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity*, Westview (1999); M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, McGraw-Hill (1996).
[4] J. F. Annett, *Superconductivity, superfluids, and condensates*, Oxford University Press (2005); G. E. Volovik, *The universe in a helium droplet*, Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys. **117** pp. 1-507 (2003).
[5] R. Resta, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66** 899 (1994).
[6] D. J. Scalapino, S. R. White, S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** 2830 (1992); D. J. Scalapino, S. R. White, S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **47** 7995 (1993).
[7] B. Hetényi, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **83** 034711 (2014).
[8] M. Imada, A. Fujimori, and Y. Tokura, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70** 1039 (1998); N. F. Mott, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **40** 677 (1968).
[9] P. W. Anderson, *The Theory of Superconductivity in the High-T_c Cuprates*, Princeton University Press (1997).
[10] G. Uhrig and D. Vollhardt, *Phys. Rev. B* **52** 5617 (1995).
[11] N. Andrei, E. Shimshoni, and A. Rosch, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **695** 315 (2003).
[12] E. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **20** 1445 (1968).
[13] B. S. Shastry and B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** 243 (1990).
[14] T. Giamarchi, *Phys. Rev. B* **44** 2905 (1991).
[15] R. Resta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 1800 (1998).
[16] R. Resta and S. Sorella, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** 370 (1999).
[17] B. Hetényi, *Phys. Rev. B* **87** 235123 (2013), *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **81** 124711 (2012).
[18] C. N. Yang, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **34** 694 (1962).
[19] H. Fröhlich, *Proc. R. Soc. Ser. A* **223** 296 (1954).
[20] B. S. Deaver Jr. and W. M. Fairbank, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **7** 43 (1961).
[21] T. Timusk and B. Statt *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **62** 61 (1999).
[22] O. Penrose and L. Onsager, *Phys. Rev.* **104** 576 (1956).
[23] N. Byers and C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **7** 46 (1961).
[24] L. Onsager, *Nuovo Cimento* **6** (Suppl. 2) 249, 261 (1949); R. P. Feynman, *Progress in Low Temperature Physics*, Editor: C. J. Gorter (North-Holland, Amsterdam), Vol 1, p. 17, (1955).
[25] G. Grosso and G. Pastori Parravicini, *Solid State Physics*,

Academic Press (2000); N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, Harcourt Brace (1976).